

STATUS CONFERENCE  
BEFORE THE  
ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

|                               |   |            |
|-------------------------------|---|------------|
| In the Matter of the:         | ) |            |
|                               | ) |            |
| Application for Certification | ) | Docket No. |
| for the Hidden Hills Solar    | ) | 11-AFC-02  |
| Electric Generating System    | ) |            |
| <hr/>                         | ) |            |

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
HEARING ROOM A  
1516 NINTH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, JULY 9, 2012

1:00 p.m.

Reported by:  
John Cota  
Contract No. 170-09-002

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Karen Douglas, Presiding Member

Carla Peterman, Associate Member

HEARING OFFICER, ADVISORS PRESENT

Kenneth Celli, Hearing Officer

Galen Lemei, Advisor to Commissioner Douglas

Eileen Allen, Commissioners' Technical Adviser

CEC STAFF PRESENT

Richard Ratliff, Staff Counsel

Kerry Willis, Staff Counsel

Mike Monasmith, Project Manager

OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC ADVISER

Jennifer Jennings, Public Adviser

APPLICANT

Jeff Harris, Attorney  
Ellison, Schneider and Harris, LLP

Clay Jensen  
Gary Kazio  
Tracy Wheaton  
Bradley Brownlow (via WebEx)  
Christopher Moore (via WebEx)  
BrightSource Energy

John Carrier  
CH2MHill

Susan Strachan  
Strachan Consulting, LLC

INTERVENORS

Lisa Belenky (via WebEx)  
Center for Biological Diversity

Cindy MacDonald (via WebEx)

ALSO PRESENT

Dana Crom  
Joshua Hart (via WebEx)  
County of Inyo

Jim Stroh

Manuel Alvarez (via WebEx)  
Southern California Edison

I N D E X

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Call to Order  | 1           |
| 2. Report from Applicant, Staff and Intervenors<br>regarding the status of the Hidden Hills Solar<br>Electric Generating System AFC | 6           |
| Applicant   | 6           |
| Staff   | 12          |
| Intervenor Center for Biological Diversity  | 47          |
| Intervenor MacDonald  | 52          |
| Intervenor County of Inyo   | 65          |
| 3. Public Comment   | 89          |
| 4. Adjourn  | 91          |
| Certificate of Reporter   | 92          |

P R O C E E D I N G S

1:13 p.m.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Welcome to the Status Conference for the Hidden Hills Solar Energy Generating Systems Project. I'm Commissioner Karen Douglas. I'm the Presiding Member of this committee.

To my left is our Hearing Officer, Ken Celli and to his left is Carla Peterman, my fellow commissioner and the Associate Member of this committee.

To her left, Eileen Allen the technical advisor for Siting for all of the commissioners. And to my right is Galen Lemei, my advisor.

I'd like to welcome you all here today and I'd like to ask if this point for the parties to identify themselves beginning with the applicant.

MR. HARRIS: Hi. Jeff Harris on behalf of the applicant.

MR. JENSEN: Clay Jensen with BrightSource and I'll go ahead and introduce the rest of our team in the room since there are not many of us today.

Gary Kazio is my assistant project manager with BrightSource. John Carrier is with CH2MHill on behalf of the applicant and Tracy Wheaton also with BrightSource Energy on behalf of the applicant.

PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Thank you. Oh, go

1 ahead.

2 MS. STRACHAN: This is Susan Strachan on behalf of  
3 the applicant.

4 PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Thank you. Staff.

5 MR. RATLIFF: Dick Ratliff, Counsel for the staff.

6 And with me is co-counsel Kerry Willis and the Project  
7 Manager, Mike Monasmith.

8 PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Thank you. Let's see  
9 here. Intervenors. Jon Zellhoefer, are you on the line?  
10 Jon Zellhoefer?

11 (No response.)

12 All right. How about Center for Biological  
13 Diversity?

14 MS. BELENKY: Yes. This is Lisa Belenky with the  
15 Center for Biological Diversity. And I'll be on mute most  
16 of the time because my office is a little bit loud.

17 PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Thank you. Jack  
18 Prichett, Old Spanish Trail Association?

19 (WebEx interference.)

20 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Oh no, let me get that.  
21 That's call-in user number four. No, not yet. Okay. Any  
22 way, there. Peace has been restored.

23 MR. JENSEN: Here anyway (laughter).

24 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: If it were only that easy  
25 (laughter). Okay.

1           PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: All right. Well,  
2 thanks to the Hearing Officer for that.

3           So, Jack Prichett, Old Spanish Trail Association?

4           (No response.)

5           It doesn't sound like it, not yet. What about  
6 Cindy MacDonald?

7           MS. MACDONALD: Yes. Cindy MacDonald is here,  
8 intervenor.

9           PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Thank you. Thanks for  
10 being here. Are there any representatives of public  
11 agencies present?

12           MS. CROM: Dana Crom, Deputy County Counsel on  
13 behalf of Inyo County.

14           PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: Thank you. Any other  
15 federal, state or local agencies?

16           (No response.)

17           All right. And the Public Advisor, Jennifer  
18 Jennings is in the back of the room. And with that I'll  
19 turn this over to the Hearing Officer.

20           HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you, Commissioner  
21 Douglas. A little background. This status conference on  
22 the proposed Hidden Hills Solar Energy Generating -- I'm  
23 sorry, the Hidden Hills Solar Energy Generation Systems was  
24 scheduled in a notice dated April 18, 2012. I believe we  
25 have some copies of that notice out on the table in the

1 foyer.

2 The purpose of today's conference is to hear from  
3 the parties regarding the status of Hidden Hills Solar  
4 Energy Generation Systems' application for certification or  
5 what we call an AFC and to help resolve any procedural  
6 issues as well as to assess the scheduling of future events  
7 in this proceeding.

8 We will proceed as follows. First, we're going to  
9 provide the applicant an opportunity to summarize their view  
10 of the case status and scheduling, followed by staff,  
11 followed by intervenor Jon Zellhoefer if he shows up on the  
12 phone.

13 After that we will go to the Center for Biological  
14 Diversity which would be Lisa Belenky.

15 If Jack Prichett from Old Spanish Trail  
16 Association shows up on the phone he would go next.

17 And we would finally go with Cindy MacDonald. And  
18 that is the order in which people intervened in this case.

19 After that we will then provide an opportunity for  
20 general public comment.

21 In this case, staff published a, what we're going  
22 to be calling PSA, the Preliminary Staff Assessment on May  
23 24, 2012 and what they call the Supplemental Staff  
24 Assessment. I don't know why it's not a Supplemental  
25 Preliminary Staff Assessment but, well maybe we'll find that



1 out. And that was as to Cultural only and that was  
2 published on June 15, 2012.

3 Staff combined its PSA and SSA comments. The  
4 comment periods were extended to July 23, 2012. And on June  
5 25, 2012 the staff published its Schedule Update Memo to the  
6 Committee. And attached to that memo were emails that  
7 supported staff's extension of the comment period from the  
8 intervenors Cindy MacDonald and Lisa Belenky of Center for  
9 Biological Diversity as well as Inyo County Counsel, The  
10 Nature Conservancy and The Amargosa Conservancy.

11 On June 22, 2012 the Committee gave their assent  
12 to the extension which was requested on a motion by  
13 intervenor Cindy MacDonald.

14 The Committee would like to hear from all parties  
15 regarding the schedule delays and whether the unmitigable  
16 impacts that staff declared in Traffic, Land Use, Cultural  
17 Resources and Visual Resources sections have changed at all  
18 as well as the status of previously designated unresolved  
19 matters that were identified in Biological Resources,  
20 Socioeconomics, Worker Safety and Fire Protection and  
21 Transmission Safety Engineering.

22 So, two quick last points I'd like to raise.  
23 First, the applicant stated that they would apply for the  
24 General Plan Amendment within a week or two of last, the  
25 last status conference we had in June. And so the Committee

1 is interested in the progress of that application.

2 Also, I recall that Jack Prichett had concerns  
3 regarding the need for a reference to the Old Spanish Trail  
4 being recognized as a National Historic Trails Act trail in  
5 regard to the Old Spanish Trail. But I guess we'll hear  
6 from Mr. Prichett if he calls in and whether he's satisfied  
7 with the treatment of the Old Spanish Trail in the Cultural  
8 Resources section.

9 So with that let's hear, first with applicant,  
10 please go ahead.

11 MR. HARRIS: Good afternoon. Jeff Harris on  
12 behalf of the applicant. I appreciate the opportunity to be  
13 here again today for a status conference. I think it's an  
14 important part of the process here.

15 I actually want to start with, I think, what the  
16 good news is, which is, that I think most of the sections of  
17 the PSA and I think, definitely most of the sections of the  
18 PSA are the wholly uncontested or so lightly contested that  
19 they're not going to require any live witness testimony.

20 So there are no factual issues in dispute. And I  
21 think we can submit those on the paper. At least from the  
22 applicant's perspective. I understand the other parties may  
23 disagree.

24 And I can walk you through those sections if you'd  
25 like in a moment. And also through the, I guess it's nine

1 remaining sections that we're going to have some, we're  
2 going to have some further discussions on.

3 The nature of this process is that it over  
4 emphasizes the areas where we disagree. And I just want to  
5 flag that right at the beginning. I think that's an  
6 important thing.

7 We always quickly move past the areas where  
8 there's agreement with staff and the other parties. And in  
9 this case by my count there's, you know, 16 of the 27; so a  
10 full 60 percent of the issues in our view are in that first  
11 category if things that are not going to require live  
12 witness testimony. There may be some briefing on them.  
13 There may be some disagreement on wordsmithing of conditions  
14 but no factual disputes, so.

15 I think that's very good news. And I like where  
16 the case is in that position.

17 There is an emphasis on the negative. You know,  
18 why is that? And I think the answer is pretty obvious to  
19 everybody. It's because the stakes are quite high in those  
20 areas where we disagree.

21 At one extreme we could end up with the project  
22 not being approved. At the other, somewhere in the middle  
23 of that spectrum we could end up with an approval that would  
24 be unfinanceable or unbuildable or a project that we can  
25 move forward with.

1           And so, you know, I think the project -- or the  
2 process is what it is. It emphasizes the negative because  
3 of those, of those stakes if you will, so.

4           I just want to spend some time thanking the staff  
5 for their hard work and for what we felt were some  
6 productive workshops. You know, I'm not sure everybody  
7 feels the same way especially when you're in them  
8 (laughter). When it's 106 outside and Pahrump wherever you  
9 are. But we did feel that those were very useful activities  
10 if nothing else to give us a better idea of where the  
11 disagreements lie, so.

12           Hearing Officer, if you'd like, what I'd like to  
13 do is just go through the list of all topics and kind of  
14 give you where I think things are and then after that give  
15 you some general comments on where they are. And then, if  
16 you'd like we could go subject by subject thereafter. But I  
17 thought I'd give you the sort of the scorecard to start with  
18 and then --

19           HEARING OFFICER CELLI: You know, I would  
20 appreciate that. And let me just say that I have, probably  
21 should have put one of these together for everybody but I  
22 have a little matrix of all of the, essentially the table of  
23 contents subject matter from the PSA and I would be  
24 interested in that.

25           And then I had it broken out by intervenor or a

1 party. So, yes, please go ahead.

2 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, okay. And like I said, I'd  
3 like an opportunity to kind of run down the list and then we  
4 can talk about the specifics, so.

5 In the category of what we think are, more or  
6 less, good news, largely uncontested issues, you know,  
7 factual disputes have -- and I'll try to go slowly this time  
8 Hearing Officer.

9 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you.

10 MR. HARRIS: -- project description and executive  
11 summary and general conditions. And again, there'll be some  
12 wordsmithing particularly with general conditions but we  
13 don't see any need for live witnesses on those.

14 Those are kind of what I call general categories.

15 In the engineering assessment I have five sections  
16 in my power sheet that I think are in that first category  
17 starting with facility design and power plant efficiency,  
18 power plant reliability, transmission system engineering and  
19 geological and paleontological resources.

20 I can't believe I got that out right.

21 In terms of environmental assessment I've got an  
22 additional eight sections and I've sort of combined two.  
23 I'll explain that.

24 First being, air quality. And I've included  
25 within air quality, the greenhouse gas emissions discussion.

1 It's an appendix to the air quality section but it's a  
2 separate list on some tables.

3 Hazardous materials, noise and vibrations. I'll  
4 slow down. Public health, soil and water resources, now in  
5 this case staff sort of split that out between soil and  
6 surface hydrology and water resources as two separate  
7 sections rather than soil and water --

8 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Yeah --

9 MR. HARRIS: -- so I used --

10 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: -- yeah --

11 MR. HARRIS: -- the old moniker. It should have  
12 been surface water. Is that right? The surface -- soil and  
13 surface water, I guess, is the, the staff section. The soil  
14 and surface hydrology is okay but water resources, which I  
15 think it's water supply. Right, yeah, it will be in the  
16 other category.

17 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Okay.

18 MR. HARRIS: Unfortunately. Sorry for the  
19 confusion there. We actually have traffic and  
20 transportation as being in that category and we don't see in  
21 the PSA that staff had called that a significant effect  
22 there. I'm looking at Table 4. We can come back to that.

23 Transmission line safety and nuisance and then the  
24 final one in that category, waste management.

25 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Okay.

1 MR. HARRIS: I counted those as 16 sections.  
2 Again, counting, you know, greenhouse gas and air quality as  
3 one, so.

4 In terms of the second category. And again, these  
5 are issues that we believe will either require either live  
6 witness testimony and/or briefing. Some of them will not  
7 require both. And I can talk about which ones, I think, are  
8 among those issue. But I have nine in that category.

9 And our overall goal, I think everybody's goal is  
10 to move as many of these categories from the second group up  
11 to the first group between now and the FSA.

12 But I have in those categories the following nine.  
13 Biological resources, and these are in alphabetical order I  
14 believe. Cultural resources, largely alphabetical order,  
15 I'll explain. Biological resources, cultural resources,  
16 land use as the third.

17 The fourth, socio, which I included in that, the  
18 environmental justice and the Aspen Studies within socio.

19 Fifth, visual resources, sixth, water supply,  
20 seventh, worker safety slash fire protection. And then the  
21 last two are out of alphabetical order but they're kind of  
22 in their own categories. Number eight is alternatives and  
23 number nine is growth inducing impacts.

24 So that, I think that's kind of the complete  
25 scorecard. If you'd like I can give you sort of our high-

1 level comments and then we can go through those various  
2 subjects if that's okay.

3 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you. Thank you app.  
4 Let's hear from staff. And thank you for your, the heads  
5 up on that memo.

6 MR. RATLIFF: Well, it's good news that have, I  
7 think, the same kinds of lists. Some of the areas that Jeff  
8 identified as being on the second list are ones that I have  
9 question marks about because I think we may see resolution  
10 of those in accord with things that have, are already in  
11 play.

12 For example, in worker safety and fire protection  
13 I think there is a negotiation going on that Mr. Harris  
14 could tell you more about perhaps if there's more to be said  
15 between the Inyo Fire District and the applicant over how  
16 the issues of fire protection will be resolved. So that's  
17 one that I just have a question mark beside.

18 And in the area of land use the applicant has now  
19 filed an application with the County, I understand, to try  
20 to seek changes in the County's ordinances that would make  
21 those ordinances ones that would conform to the project.  
22 So, that's one I would have a question about too.

23 The one thing that he did put on the list of  
24 issues that I think we're in agreement that I'm not entirely  
25 sure about is soils and surface water. And I may be wrong



1 but I think there were some outstanding discussions about  
2 ponding of water on the project site during flood conditions  
3 and how that would be resolved.

4 But, basically I think we're in agreement about  
5 the issues that we're in agreement about.

6 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Excellent. Anything  
7 further?

8 MR. RATLIFF: Yes. I mean, do you want me to  
9 shoot off all the fireworks at once or are you (laughter) --

10 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Well, you know, first of  
11 all, I want to thank you for just, it looks like there's  
12 been a lot of good progress, at least between applicant and  
13 staff. We'll hear from everyone else.

14 And I appreciate you using my little matrix anyway  
15 so that it makes it easy for me to see visually what, where  
16 the disputes might be.

17 Was there, I mean applicant first of all, did I  
18 cut you off by going to staff? Was there more that you  
19 wanted to say?

20 MR. HARRIS: Go ahead. It's your hearing so I  
21 want to follow along. I did have some general comments  
22 before we can go through each one of the topics.

23 However you want to proceed though Hearing  
24 Officer.

25 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Okay. I mean, what I want

1 to know is just, what we're here to find out is what are the  
2 status of things? What things can we move? What can be  
3 done at this point? I'm glad to hear that there was a  
4 general plan amendment application filed. We're interested  
5 in hearing more about that.

6 But, you can just give us the big picture.

7 MR. HARRIS: Let me give you the big picture  
8 because, I was going to say Dick stole my thunder a little  
9 bit with the fireworks metaphor. It may not be the best  
10 answer but.

11 Yeah, I think there are a number of issues on that  
12 second list that we're also hoping can move on to the first  
13 category and not be subject to hearings, so.

14 But let me make just a couple of remarks sort of  
15 at the highest level about our review of the PSA. We hadn't  
16 had a chance to thoroughly review it last time we got  
17 together. And so we have a couple of general reactions and  
18 then I will march you through each one of those nine topics  
19 briefly and explain issues that I want to flag for you that  
20 may end up before you again.

21 I'm going to use that filter as to what we talk  
22 about, so.

23 One of the concerns that we have at the highest  
24 level is that we believe the PSA spends too much time  
25 focussing on Nevada or upon impacts upon the Nevada

1 environment.

2 When CEQA clearly says that those issues are  
3 exempt from CEQA where they're subject to a NEPA process.

4 And this is, you know, an intellectually difficult  
5 siting case. And I think I mentioned at one point I thought  
6 it was like a law school exam. You put it right on the  
7 border between two states and half of the linears are in  
8 Nevada or the -- it's complex but we have, I think, a very  
9 strong view on what CEQA does allow and doesn't allow in  
10 terms of what goes on in Nevada. And we can go through each  
11 one of these nine subject matters.

12 Most of the highly contested issues in biology and  
13 in cultural resources in particular, I want to flag those  
14 two, and to a lesser extent water resources, those three  
15 issues. Most of those issues deal with effects, potential  
16 effects in Nevada that are not a result of activities on the  
17 project site per se.

18 And we're going to be briefing those issues.  
19 Obviously we'll make general comments in each of our  
20 sections. But that is one that, I think, that we really may  
21 need the Committee to decide, you know, what, how broad that  
22 CEQA exemption applies, what the sovereign state of Nevada  
23 should be doing in terms of their review on this thing.

24 And generally just recognizing that there isn't a  
25 regulatory gap here. And I think that's what you see from

1 staff is an effort, a feeling that they have to fill a gap  
2 here. That somehow some of these impacts will not be looked  
3 at. And I just don't think that's the case.

4 I think CEQA contemplates exactly the law school  
5 exam. I talked about a case with a project on the border  
6 like this where it is subject to the NEPA process.

7 And that really is key here. There is a separate  
8 parallel NEPA process. This project is a connected action  
9 under NEPA to that process.

10 And so, intellectually I understand how that is a  
11 difficult thing to do. But that's one where we're  
12 definitely going to potentially be asking the Committee that  
13 step in on some of those issues and it does flow through  
14 pretty much all the subject matters that we're talking about  
15 today.

16 But the other kind of high level comment that we  
17 have is that the staff has been, and I think by their own  
18 terminology, very conservative in their analysis. And I  
19 guess I'd describe as sort of ultra conservative.

20 And it arises from the fact that we can't know the  
21 future with perfect clarity, you know. There's always going  
22 to be some uncertainty going forward on these projects.  
23 What will be the impacts over a long period of time?

24 You know, fortunately, CEQA doesn't require us to  
25 be clairvoyant. It does require that there be substantial

1 evidence in the record from which a reasonable decision make  
2 can make an informed decision.

3 It doesn't require you to be, you know, quote,  
4 very conservative to protect against unknown threats. And  
5 it doesn't require to look at issues as if, well we don't  
6 know so we have to assume.

7 And that is a very unfair characterization of  
8 staff's position and I'm doing it to make the point,  
9 obviously. But there's a feeling in a lot of these sections  
10 that staff has said essentially, well we're not really sure  
11 so we'd better be very conservative, require some mitigation  
12 and require some monitoring.

13 And in particular, in cultural and biology and the  
14 water resources areas. Those are three that we see as being  
15 significant.

16 So want to avoid that any impact is a potentially  
17 significant impact and focus really on the question of  
18 substantial evidence and what a reasonable decision maker  
19 such as yourself needs to be able to make a decision in this  
20 case.

21 In terms of specific subject matters, with  
22 biological resources at the first of the nine that we're  
23 talking about there is a lot of discussion about  
24 groundwater-dependent vegetation. There's a relation back  
25 to the water supply discussion. That all very much focusses

1 on a resource that is in Nevada. We think we have an  
2 obligation to demonstrate that the activities on site will  
3 not have an impact off site.

4 But this is where sort of the ultra conservative  
5 nature of the analysis is giving us trouble. And we're  
6 going to have a lot of discussion, I think, between now and  
7 the FSA with staff about just what does it mean, you know,  
8 our water use and how is that affecting a potential resource  
9 that's on the other side? I'll talk more about that when I  
10 talk about water resources.

11 So I just flagged first water-dependent  
12 vegetation. The second thing I'd flag in biology is the  
13 mitigation ratios for Desert Tortoise.

14 This is Desert Tortoise habitat in the sense that  
15 it is in the desert. We think it's a very degraded habitat.  
16 We think that the farther you move to the west away from the  
17 Nevada line, the less habitat that quality there is.

18 And to the extent that two Desert Tortoise were  
19 found on site they were found in that area near the border.

20 So we've, actually I think, had some pretty  
21 productive discussions with staff about what's the  
22 appropriate ratio. Is it one to one? Staff is saying,  
23 three to one for part, two to one for -- or one to one for  
24 another part.

25 We'd like our experts to give your staff some more

1 feedback on those ratios. And that goes a long way towards  
2 the whole discussion about overall mitigation obligations of  
3 the project and the quality of the habitat.

4 I don't think this is pristine habitat at all. If  
5 you look on Google Earth you'll notice the roads cut in  
6 there. I'm not sure that we offered this up as mitigation  
7 lands that the agencies would accept it.

8 So, we think the mitigation ratios ought to  
9 reflect that issue.

10 The third kind of higher level, again, is  
11 treatment of non-threatened endangered species as special  
12 status. And again, this is another sort of intellectually  
13 complex issue that we're going to ask the Committee to sort  
14 of take apart.

15 There is only one threatened or endangered species  
16 on the project site, that's the Desert Tortoise. It's the  
17 only one listed under California's CESA or the federal ESA  
18 law.

19 There are a bunch of different categories that the  
20 resource agencies have put in place like species of special  
21 concern, sensitive species, those kinds of categories.

22 But those are not ESA or CESA categories. And one  
23 of the concerns that we have is sort of the melding  
24 together, if you will, of those threatened endangered  
25 species issues with the other common species issues.

1           And we're going to spend a lot of time talking  
2 about those issues, in particular with special status plants  
3 as well.

4           Special status plants is a term of art that has  
5 been developed by the agencies. Again, it's not threatened  
6 or endangered. There are no threatened or endangered  
7 species on the project site. But there is a list of plants  
8 that's prepared by the California Native Plant Society and a  
9 division of CDFG of which I always forget the name.

10           But that list is put together over time. One of  
11 the things we'd like staff to do in the FSA is explain how  
12 that list is developed because I think that's really  
13 instructive. It really is a non-public process. It's a  
14 message board among botanists and biologists creating  
15 information back and forth and ultimately a decision made on  
16 ranking.

17           Those rankings then are used to determine whether  
18 a species is one that merits further mitigation or  
19 protection.

20           And that whole process happens sort of in a black  
21 box. And it has big impacts on the siting of this project  
22 and the siting of other projects in California.

23           And again, we think the staff and the applicant  
24 should have the right to understand exactly how that list is  
25 created in moving forward, so.



1 Desert washes, Mr. Ratliff mentioned briefly  
2 there's some issues there. I think we're going to be able  
3 to work through those. We're a little concerned about some  
4 of the discussions about impacts off the project site,  
5 again, in Nevada. And also the mitigation ratios of one to  
6 one there.

7 And then just kind of at the highest level on  
8 biology, there seems to be sort of this double or triple or  
9 quadruple counting of acres.

10 And the project site is 32 hundred and 77 acres of  
11 impacts. We're being asked to mitigate 3277 for Desert  
12 Tortoise. We're also being asked to mitigate 660 acres for  
13 Burrowing Owl which is that habitat. It's within the 3277.  
14 It's a subset.

15 The same for state waters. The same for special  
16 status plants and other plants. So there isn't a discussion  
17 of nesting of those criteria, of those various impacts. But  
18 it does start to feel like double, triple and quadruple  
19 counting of acreages that at the end of the day it's 3277  
20 and not 3277-plus, so.

21 Those are issues that we're going to hopefully  
22 going to work through on biology with the staff.

23 Cultural resources is another section that we  
24 would commend further analysis. We're concerned about the  
25 nature and the scope of that analysis. It seems to be sort

1 of, I'd use the word unprecedented in terms of analysis.

2 In particular, looking at landscapes, at the  
3 graphic landscapes. And I had the PSA section up. I think  
4 I directed a figure number two which talks about the  
5 Saltscape Trail. That trail takes into consideration four  
6 western states; California, Nevada, Arizona and Utah.

7 And, you know, setting aside the CEQA being a  
8 California law issue to begin with, that's a scope of  
9 analysis that to me I've never had, I've never seen.

10 We're concerned about the nature of that analysis,  
11 the scope of the analysis and whether there's actually a  
12 historic resource at issue with those particular landscapes.

13 And that's something that, I haven't seen in all my  
14 practice here at the Commission.

15 We're also concerned that much of that analysis is  
16 based on a confidential appendix that we haven't seen nor am  
17 I sure we should see or will see. That to me is a new  
18 precedent at the Commission and one that really is sort of a  
19 red flag.

20 I don't know how you deal with a confidential  
21 appendix as a basis for a finding under cultural resources.

22 And it's new ground. I've never had to deal with that  
23 before. And anytime it's something new like that it gives  
24 me pause and concern. And so, we commend you to kind of  
25 look at that issue and figure out how fundamentally we can

1 test the staff's conclusions based on a document that is  
2 confidential.

3 I'll go through the last ones rather quickly  
4 because I think we can do that. No, I should ask Clay to  
5 speak on the third issue of land use.

6 You'd mentioned the general plan amendment and --  
7 why don't you give kind of a quick update on where we are in  
8 that process.

9 MR. JENSEN: Sure. Again, Clay Jensen,  
10 BrightSource Energy. And I believe Mr. Ratliff pointed to  
11 the fact that we have, in fact, applied for a general plan  
12 overlay and a zoning overlay with Inyo County.

13 We've also fundamentally come to an agreement on  
14 terms of a reimbursement and processing agreement that goes  
15 to their Board tomorrow. So Ms. Crom can provide more  
16 detail on that.

17 But we are moving forward. We've got, we consider  
18 to be the applications are just now in. And we look forward  
19 to working with Inyo County on establishing a time line  
20 schedule for that process over the next few weeks. And look  
21 forward to getting fully engaged.

22 MR. HARRIS: This is one of the issues that we're  
23 actually hoping we'll be able to resolve. If we're not able  
24 to resolve it I actually don't think it will require live  
25 testimony because they are legal issues. I don't think

1 there's going to be a factual dispute. I'm willing to think  
2 about that some more but I think it may be an issue that  
3 ultimately is probably briefed regardless.

4 The fourth issue of socio-economic and  
5 environmental justice. I'll go through that one quickly.  
6 You know we are working to review those issues moving  
7 forward.

8 I actually don't know that we'll have to litigate  
9 this issue at all. There is an Aspen Report that everybody  
10 is going to get a chance to comment on that may be updated  
11 or revised based upon comments. But we found that to be  
12 very helpful, so.

13 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Can you, just for  
14 everybody listening in, can you kind of give us the big  
15 picture of what the socio issues are right now. What are we  
16 talking about?

17 Is this taxation? I mean, what --

18 MR. HARRIS: That's a tough question so I'll let  
19 Clay answer it (laughter).

20 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: I don't want to, you know,  
21 I just want to make sure that we're all talking about the  
22 same thing.

23 MR. JENSEN: Sure. I'll be real brief. And Ms.  
24 Crom can weigh in here as well but. We continue to work  
25 with Inyo County on a variety of issues.

1           Inyo County has indicated at the workshop we had  
2 in Bishop that their goal is to focus on the revenue  
3 projections as stated by, as stated in the Aspen Report  
4 which I think for us, and we've had dialogue directly with  
5 Inyo County as well, is a healthy direction for this  
6 dialogue to go.

7           We've spent a lot of time talking about potential  
8 cost impacts or cost implications to the County as a result  
9 of the impacts of the project.

10           I think that the PSA addresses some of those  
11 concerns that were raised but perhaps not all of them that  
12 Inyo County was hopeful.

13           We're endeavoring and very hopeful that we'll  
14 enter an agreement between BrightSource and Inyo County  
15 directly to address any gaps that may be contained between  
16 the reports.

17           Again, we look forward to working through those  
18 issues but we have shifted the focus more to a revenue side  
19 description and we think that's, it gets us out of the weeds  
20 on some of the cost-related impacts.

21           So we look forward to having that dialogue. It  
22 hasn't started yet. The general plan application is now in.  
23 It goes to the Board tomorrow for adoption of the agreement.

24           Once that's settled, and we believe hopefully  
25 that'll go well tomorrow, we hope to be in engaged dialogue.

1 We have -- we're working through a draft term sheet.

2 So we're making some progress.

3 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you. I appreciate  
4 the clarification. Mr. Harris you still have the floor.

5 MR. HARRIS: Thank you. Visual resources, again  
6 I'll just kind of list some of the issues we're concerned  
7 about.

8 Methodology in this particular PSA is a little  
9 different than we've seen in previous Commission decisions.

10 In particular, at one time, I think it was a 500 viewers  
11 were considered a high number of viewers. Under the staff's  
12 new matrix that number has moved from 500 to 50.

13 We're not really sure why that is. But we want to  
14 probe that issue some more and talk about the methodology in  
15 general.

16 We have some issues with some of the KOPs being  
17 located in Nevada. And again, this is sort of the larger  
18 California/Nevada CEQA issue that we talked about at the  
19 top. So I'll just go by that one pretty quickly.

20 In terms of the analysis though there's, BLM has  
21 visual criteria, their visual resource inventory and their  
22 visual resource management. We need to, I guess, remind  
23 folks first off, the project is not on federal land. I know  
24 this is being used as an analogy.

25 The surrounding federal lands are pretty high in

1 terms of that VRM system. They are three and four which are  
2 the categories that allow for the most uses, if you will.

3 But again, the project is not within the BLM  
4 areas. Those criteria do not apply looking, you know, out  
5 at BLM lands. You know, since we're standing on the edge of  
6 the BLM lands looking at the project site. That's not what  
7 that system was created for.

8 And so, we have some comments about the  
9 application of the BLM and Parks Service methodologies. And  
10 Mr. Wheatland from my office will be dealing more with those  
11 issues than I will. But there are some concerns there.

12 We do think this area is the right area for, from  
13 a visual perspective for a project. And in its comments on  
14 the PEIS for solar energy Inyo County had stated that  
15 private development lands in the Charleston view area south  
16 and west of Pahrump would be excellent lands on which to  
17 locate a solar production as well as support operations for  
18 solar development both in Inyo and Nevada.

19 So we feel like we're in the right place. And  
20 with the right criteria applied we might end up with a  
21 different result than where the staff is on these issues,  
22 so.

23 Water supply, this is another issue that is tied  
24 very closely to biology and cultural resources. One of the  
25 concerns that we have is that we don't feel like we're

1 getting credit for the one-to-one offset that we've agreed  
2 to.

3 A long time ago before this project, you know, was  
4 even close to a PSA stage that the company made a commitment  
5 to understanding, you know, to show its understanding of the  
6 importance of water in the desert.

7 And we've committed to go out and get a 140 acre  
8 feet a year of water rights, active water rights and retire  
9 those before the project moves forward.

10 There's a good argument that that should be the  
11 end of it. You know, we're going to be retiring 140 acre  
12 feet of water. The project will use a maximum of 140 acre  
13 feet of water which means in all likelihood it'll be much  
14 less than that every year.

15 So on an annual basis we feel like the basin is  
16 going to be net good, if you will. And that ought to be the  
17 end of the inquiry in some, you know, some view of things.

18 That we understand that we want to make sure that  
19 we don't have impacts on surrounding areas and Clay  
20 committed a long time ago to make sure that everybody in  
21 Charleston view that their wells were, that they were made  
22 whole. That if there were any problems with their wells as  
23 a result of the project operations that we would monitor for  
24 that and that if necessary we would take care of any issues,  
25 you know, doing, drilling wells deeper or what have you.



1           That was the initial commitment of the company.  
2   That's reflected in the document. And I think that's a good  
3   thing. But now what we are seeing is a really heavy  
4   emphasis on groundwater issues and the potential to affect  
5   Nevada groundwater which in turn affects Nevada Mesquite  
6   Bosque, it's not Bosque, Mesquite Scrub on BLM lands.

7           And that's, I think, really at the core of the  
8   disagreement between the staff and the applicant is on the  
9   nature and the scope of the analysis in terms of potential  
10  offsite impacts in Nevada.

11           We've done some modelling which we think is very  
12  conservative to show that the impacts from the project  
13  wells, the 140 acre feet will be onsite and not across the  
14  line and in Nevada. And this is one of those areas where I  
15  think, you know, an ultra conservative approach is being  
16  applied and that you really ought to look at potential  
17  impacts of the project and not have as some looking at  
18  what's going on across the border in Nevada.

19           The staff's proposal also has a shut down  
20  requirement for water. It literally requires the project to  
21  stop pumping if certain thresholds are met. And that will  
22  just make this project completely unfinanceable.

23           And so that for us will be something that I think  
24  is unprecedented to the Commission that we will want to make  
25  sure that we deal with and change it; especially given where

1 the project is and the other uses that can take place on  
2 this land.

3 And so, those are some important things that we're  
4 going to play forward. There is some understanding about  
5 the basin characteristics and California water law. But  
6 needless to say, this will be an important issue.

7 And we really do want to emphasize, you know, our  
8 start with one-to-one offset at the beginning and move  
9 forward from there.

10 Worker safety and fire protection, the next issue,  
11 pretty straight forward there. As Mr. Ratliff did mention  
12 we are talking to Southern Inyo Fire Protection District  
13 about reaching an agreement with them to figure out what  
14 kind of services they will need. That's moving forward.  
15 I'm not sure we'll need to have live witnesses on those  
16 issues if we get to where we want to get to and that's where  
17 we hope to be.

18 We think the analysis, the staff assessment is  
19 pretty good on those issues now but we can probably put  
20 these issues to bed with that agreement with Inyo Fire  
21 Protection District. And that's where we'd like to get it  
22 with that one.

23 Moving on to the kind of general topics of  
24 alternatives. We had kind of a long and semi-painful  
25 workshop on alternatives and other issues recently. And it

1 really just comes down to a couple of things that are  
2 actually more legal issues but they have real world  
3 ramifications for the project and may require some live  
4 testimony.

5           At the highest level there's kind of two or three  
6 things that we really want to see change between the PSA and  
7 the FSA. And that is, I guess greater attention paid to the  
8 applicant's basic project objectives.

9           CEQA requires that you look at a reasonable range  
10 of feasible alternatives to the project and the project site  
11 which will feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of  
12 the project.

13           And our contention is that while the applicant's  
14 basic objectives are not, you know, the end all be all,  
15 there is some independent analysis that has to be done by  
16 staff. But nevertheless, those really do frame up the  
17 nature and the scope of the alternatives analysis.

18           The section as we feel, and we're going to provide  
19 some case law citations, is critical of our objectives and  
20 suggests that they're too narrow. We think there's good  
21 case law on point that suggests that that's okay.

22           It makes sense that if your objective is to  
23 build an aquarium in San Francisco that it be located on the  
24 water for example. There's a case on that but I over  
25 simplified it.

1           Another case where the objective was to expand a  
2 campus and not looking at offsite alternatives made sense  
3 there. And there's three or four other ones. And I don't  
4 want to bore you with the details but I think there's a  
5 spectrum here between adherence to the applicant's  
6 objectives and the staff or the lead agency going off and  
7 writing their own.

8           And we feel we've come too far down the spectrum  
9 towards an independent analysis that doesn't weight our  
10 objectives efficiently. And so we're going to be providing  
11 our written comments on that issue and hopefully see a  
12 little bit of change in the document between PSA and FSA.

13           A second issue in alternatives which is really  
14 unique to this project is the no project alternative.  
15 That's one that I think is unusual for this project and we  
16 had some discussion about this at the workshop.

17           But as it stands now there are 270 home sites out  
18 there that could be built today if the building permit was  
19 pulled. That's a significant change or difference than a  
20 project site that is undeveloped land, undeveloped public  
21 land.

22           We think that actually feeds into the no project  
23 alternative in that you have to look at what's reasonably  
24 foreseeable out there. And we believe it's reasonably  
25 foreseeable that you could have housing developments pull

1 those permits, maybe not all 270 of them but some portion of  
2 them, especially with the roads and the infrastructures out  
3 there.

4 That is most important in, I think, in the  
5 analysis of the no project alternative as it relates to, as  
6 to water use as one and biological resources and cultural  
7 resources which are three of the most contested issues in  
8 this case.

9 I think from a biological perspective it's  
10 substantially different if you assume a no project  
11 alternative of the project not being approved.

12 You have an opportunity for those lands to be  
13 developed without individual homeowners being required to go  
14 out and get one-to-one mitigation for their land. There  
15 wouldn't be any offsite mitigation.

16 The same thing with the rare plant issues, same  
17 thing with the desert washes, same thing with each one of  
18 these issues moving forward.

19 Now they would obviously have to adhere to  
20 existing laws. But you wouldn't have an individual  
21 homeowner being placed with those kinds of burdens. And so  
22 there wouldn't be the kind of mitigation we're talking about  
23 here.

24 That 270 residential units is a big, big  
25 difference in the no project alternative in this case. And

1 it's, again, intellectually difficult but one we thing that  
2 we all need to wrestle with.

3 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Would you require them  
4 being built one at a time? So if a big developer came in  
5 and said, I want to build 270 homes, he'd be subject to the  
6 same sort of analysis as this project.

7 MR. HARRIS: That, yeah that's, those are two  
8 different, very different scenarios. Thank you for the  
9 question because you have the existing conditions out there  
10 now versus what would be kind of a master development,  
11 master community development out there.

12 That kind of master plan development community  
13 would require a CEQA analysis, be going through the same  
14 process.

15 But what we're talking about are the existing  
16 conditions on site. And I know Ms. Crom is going to have  
17 some comments on this issue.

18 But the baseline is what's reasonably foreseeable  
19 if, I'm using the word baseline here incorrectly.

20 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Yeah, I know, project.

21 MR. HARRIS: The issue is, yeah, the no project  
22 alternative is what's reasonably foreseeable out there  
23 moving forward. And that is reasonably foreseeable that  
24 these could be developed.

25 And, you know, you start talking about water use

1 on the, what the 20 to 40 acres sites (conferring) 20 to 40  
2 acre project sites, 270 of them. That's probably at least  
3 an acre foot or more. I think one acre foot, the two acre  
4 foot for a project of that size is not unreasonable even if  
5 you assume, you know, one-half an acre foot for 270 sites.  
6 That's 135 acre feet of water without any offset I would add  
7 as well.

8           So, from a no project alternative we think that's  
9 a really important issue for the Committee to take a look at  
10 and we'll talk to staff more and provide our comments on  
11 that.

12           We had some discussion with staff on a couple of  
13 the tables in terms of determining significance. Actually,  
14 I think we have a better understanding now where staff was  
15 going on, I think it's Appendix 2 of the alternatives  
16 sections where they lay out the various project  
17 alternatives.

18           And there are a couple of sections, particularly  
19 as it relates to the PV alternative and the trough  
20 alternative where we think the chart doesn't match up with  
21 the analysis in the PSA. Cultural resources in particular  
22 is one area where we don't see a difference at all between  
23 the Hidden Hills Project and those other technologies.

24           That's kind of a footnote. It's sort of sad to  
25 see that we're getting to the point now where we're going to

1 have to, you know, compete, competing renewable technologies  
2 as part of the alternatives analysis.

3 But I understand. My view on that representing PV  
4 developers and wind developers and other folks is we ought  
5 to have as much of every kind as we possibly can and not pit  
6 them against each other. But that's, that's more of a  
7 policy question. This is not a policy document obviously.

8 The last section is growth inducing impacts.  
9 We'll have legal comments on that. I don't believe there  
10 will be any public testimony or a need for any factual  
11 development on that issue. And it really does go to the  
12 question of what's reasonably foreseeable in growth inducing  
13 impacts which is actually more of a NEPA concept.

14 But I understand the desire to check that box. So  
15 we'll have comments on that section as well.

16 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you Mr. Harris.

17 Let me, I just want to check in right now with all  
18 of the people who are on the telephone. I want to see if  
19 Jon Zellhoefer -- so I'm going to unmute everybody.

20 (WebEx interference).

21 If you have your, I hear small children in the  
22 background. If you can mute your phone. I appreciate it.

23 Is Jon Zellhoefer on the phone? Jon are you  
24 there?

25 (No response.)



1           How about Jack Prichett from Old Spanish Trail  
2 Association? Jack are you there?

3           (No response.)

4           No. I'm missing someone. All right, so, okay.

5           I'm sorry for the interruption. I just want to,  
6 if these people come in I want them to be acknowledged. And  
7 if you're on the phone now and you don't wish to speak I'd  
8 appreciate it if you would mute the phone on your end so we  
9 don't have to hear your dogs barking, your other, you know,  
10 noise in the background.

11           A couple of things just before we move on. You  
12 were talking about purchase of offsets for water, the water  
13 rights. Are those, those are groundwater rights? Those are  
14 in Nevada aren't they? Okay. I just wanted to know.

15           MR. JENSEN: Yeah, that's correct. In Nevada,  
16 correct.

17           HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Because I wasn't aware of  
18 anything like that in California.

19           MR. HARRIS: They're up-gradient, if you will to,  
20 from the project site, so. There's a slight downhill  
21 gradient towards the project site.

22           HEARING OFFICER CELLI: You raised the issue of  
23 confidential. That's a real problem. And that, at this  
24 moment I have no answer. I don't know how to resolve it but  
25 I do have some experience with confidential documents sort

1 of coming in the record. But if they come in as  
2 confidential we really can't make a decision based on  
3 confidential information.

4 We've tried to do in camera in the past. It was a  
5 disaster. And so, anything the parties can do to get out of  
6 having the Committee have to deal with a confidential  
7 document would be greatly appreciated.

8 Because it's a thorny issue and it affects what  
9 happens to this decision later. So I want, I just want to  
10 raise that point that you made.

11 And then, I think that was, let me just look to  
12 see if there was anything else. Yeah, let's just, I'm just  
13 going to go around and then I'll ask my questions later.

14 But thank you very much for the clarification and  
15 the more in-depth analysis of the real status of what's  
16 going on.

17 Staff, anything in response to what the applicant  
18 said?

19 MR. RATLIFF: Well, unlike Mr. Harris I didn't  
20 save my or prepare my summations speech for the final  
21 hearing for today. But, I can't let all of these statements  
22 go completely unremarked upon.

23 But I'll start on a positive note. We've had  
24 three workshops since you last had us before you. And I  
25 thought those workshops were quite productive.

1 I think the more we get together the more we  
2 understand the issues that we have that are difficult to  
3 resolve and the ones that we can resolve.

4 And some of them, I think, we are going to  
5 resolve. And some remain difficult.

6 Going beyond that to the points that Mr. Harris  
7 makes I think he tripped through about 20 legal matters with  
8 which we have disagreement and I would say sometimes,  
9 profound disagreement and about 100 issues of evidentiary  
10 determination which you don't have the evidence on.

11 And you'll have to see the evidence before you  
12 make up your mind. And I'm not going to try to give you the  
13 evidence today. I don't think that would be productive.

14 But I will try to hit a few of the high points of  
15 what you just heard.

16 To begin with CEQA and the guidelines that  
17 implement them have a provision that says that CEQA does not  
18 apply to projects which are not in the state of California  
19 or parts of projects that are not in the state of California  
20 so long as those projects, those parts of projects or  
21 separate projects that are outside of the state will be  
22 covered by some other process of environmental analysis such  
23 as NEPA.

24 And we're very aware of this. The applicant made  
25 us aware of this from day one and we agree with them that

1 there is such a restriction; where it's not a restriction at  
2 least a lack of duty to do that kind of analysis.

3 And I think we are observing it in this case. But  
4 we absolutely disagree if, in fact, what we hear applicant  
5 now saying is that, a California project which has impacts  
6 on the other side of the border; and this project sits  
7 precisely on the border, that this statutory provision  
8 disallows the analysis of impacts from that California  
9 project on the other side of the border.

10 We don't think that that is within at all the  
11 black letter meaning of the law. And we have not precede it  
12 in the court.

13 And I would point out that the applicant  
14 apparently didn't believe it when they filed their AFC  
15 either because their AFC has plenty of environmental  
16 analysis on projects in Nevada.

17 It includes KOPs in Nevada. It includes  
18 discussion on the Pahrump Water Basin and any number of  
19 other things which suggest that, at least, someone on the  
20 applicant's side it occurred to them that maybe a California  
21 project that has impacts on Nevada, those impacts ought to  
22 be analyzed.

23 The second issue that I think I'd want to discuss  
24 is staff's so-called conservative analysis. I don't know if  
25 it's a conservative analysis. I think here we're talking

1 about water actually.

2 But, when we talk about water I think, when you  
3 talk about a conservative analysis whatever that means, I  
4 don't know what these terms mean in reality when you use  
5 them in this way but, I just remind you that CEQA if  
6 anything embodies the precautionary principle.

7 And one of the things that we're struggling with  
8 and I think the Commission will have to struggle with  
9 ultimately is we're making a decision here where there is  
10 going to be uncertainty.

11 And the uncertainty of the impact is one which I  
12 think is important and one which I think we would be remiss  
13 not to remark upon.

14 And in the, with the level of uncertainty that we  
15 have we simply are not convinced by what we've heard so far  
16 that there just simply isn't an issue about the impacts that  
17 this project will have on groundwater. We don't see that.

18 On the issue of Desert Tortoise habitat there's  
19 much that Mr. Harris said that I think we could agree with.  
20 To some extent the project habitat, I think he used the  
21 words, is not pristine or is degraded, it certainly is not  
22 pristine. We've never suggested that it was.

23 That doesn't mean that it isn't important desert  
24 habitat. It doesn't mean that it couldn't be better Desert  
25 Tortoise habitat nor does it mean that you don't compensate

1 for the impact of that habitat under the California  
2 Endangered Species Act which requires impact to species to  
3 be fully mitigated.

4           So we've, I think, made some progress in  
5 discussing that habitat. The applicant has told us that  
6 they are going to give us their evaluation of the habitat  
7 which will differ from ours. And we're very interested in  
8 that.

9           We've expressed openness to trying to understand  
10 to reach agreement about that. But we haven't seen it yet.

11           With regard to double counting, I think as I think  
12 was mentioned, we're mitigating for a number of different  
13 impacts. These are impacts to rare plants as well as Desert  
14 Tortoise and other species which the Department of Fish And  
15 Game has routinely required mitigation and which the Energy  
16 Commission and its cases has routinely required mitigation  
17 for at least 20 years.

18           And I don't think, I think it would be a real  
19 departure for us to say, well it's not listed under the  
20 California Endangered Species Act, we really don't care  
21 about mitigating for these issues. That may mean that  
22 you're, there's no requirement under the Endangered Species  
23 Act but there is still a requirement under CEQA that you  
24 address these issues. And that's why we're trying to  
25 address them.

1 Under the issue of cultural resources I think the  
2 term, unprecedented and confidential info, information, were  
3 two of the terms; the second one of which I think made an  
4 impression on the Committee. In some ways I think our  
5 ethnographic analysis in the PSA is unprecedented. And I  
6 would acknowledge that.

7 That doesn't mean it's wrong. It doesn't mean we  
8 shouldn't be doing them in areas where there is ethnographic  
9 significance to Native Americans. And that's what we've  
10 tried to do.

11 Some of that analysis is based on information  
12 which was given, I think, under the perception that it was  
13 confidential by Native Americans in discussing that with  
14 staff.

15 I've made it very clear to Mr. Harris that if  
16 staff is going to base its conclusions or its mitigation  
17 proposals on information, it will be information that has to  
18 be available to the applicant as matter of due process. We  
19 believe that's required and we intend to see that that  
20 happens.

21 We will either remove the kinds of analysis that  
22 we have from the FSA if it has to be confidential or at  
23 least, when I say confidential, at least if it cannot be  
24 revealed to the applicant because the applicant has a due  
25 process right to it.

1 But in any case I think these are resolvable  
2 issues. And I think they will be resolved. And so I think  
3 you should just wait and see how that plays out.

4 In terms of visual resources, I would emphasize  
5 the staff has not changed its analytic approach. And I  
6 don't think number of viewers is really going to be the  
7 question here about the impact of this project.

8 Secondly, this reference to BLM's method,  
9 you're going to hear more about that when we do get to  
10 testimony. I think it's discussed reasonably well in the  
11 PSA. BLM does have management categories. Those are not  
12 reflective of impact to visual resources. Our discussion, I  
13 think, covers that.

14 And finally, with regard to alternatives, I mean I  
15 can't really pass by that easily. We don't, when it comes  
16 to alternatives have BrightSource say that the only place,  
17 the only alternative, there really is no alternative to our  
18 project. It has to be our technology in this place in this  
19 manner on this particular footprint.

20 If we did that we don't need to have an  
21 alternatives analysis at all. And, so I think we reject  
22 that. I think what we need actually if there's going to be  
23 legal sufficiency for whatever decision you make,  
24 particularly if you're going to approve this project; you  
25 need a robust alternatives analysis. And that's what we



1 intend to provide.

2           Is regards whatever San Francisco case, I assume  
3 that what they are talking about is the BCDC case. My  
4 recollection of that case is that it was very fact dependent  
5 on the nature of the project and its relationship to the  
6 water.

7           I don't think that, you know, I'll be interested  
8 to see what that case is and how it's being analyzed to show  
9 any actual relevance to the situation that we have here.  
10 And that's really about all I have to say about that.

11           HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Well, thank you very much.  
12 And you're absolutely right. It, I'm not prejudging but  
13 I've, at least, been through these facts at least once. And  
14 they are lots of indicia to lead us to believe that an  
15 override may very well be required in the end if this one is  
16 ever going to go.

17           And, in order to do that we would need a very  
18 robust alternatives analysis. So, I appreciate staff's  
19 diligence in that matter. And I appreciate the points that  
20 you made.

21           Before I go on to ask the intervenors, I just  
22 wanted to ask you Mr. Ratliff or Mr. Monasmith, are there  
23 any further workshops scheduled? Are we finished with  
24 workshops? Where are we at with that?

25           MR. RATLIFF: No, we have additional workshops

1 contemplated currently on the issue of what's been called  
2 solar flux which is the impact on birds from heat from the  
3 mirrors that is, well, an issue of concern let me put it for  
4 the power tower projects.

5           We have, right now we're waiting for an analysis  
6 that BrightSource is doing which will, I think, be  
7 indicative of, as I understand it, of the areas in which  
8 there is heat coming off the mirrors as well as coming off  
9 from the solar receptor as well which could be injurious to  
10 birds.

11           And we hope to have that I think in the last week  
12 of this month. And to workshop it in, I think, August 8th  
13 is the tentative plan for the workshop on that.

14           We also have some additional issues that I think  
15 might fruitfully benefit from additional workshops regarding  
16 rare plants for one thing, but also regarding other issues  
17 concerning wildlife resources that the Bureau of Land  
18 Management and the Department of Fish and Game are  
19 interested in.

20           And those are with regard not only to the Desert  
21 Tortoise but the other species of special concern such as  
22 Burrowing Owl and Kit Fox which are on the site.

23           HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you. Now I'm going  
24 to, I need to unmute some people. So I'm going to ask if,  
25 Jon Zellhoefer are you on the line? Mr. Zellhoefer are you

1 on the telephone?

2 (No response.)

3 I'm not hearing anything. Then, Lisa Belenky from  
4 the Center for Biological Diversity?

5 MS. BELENKY: Yes.

6 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Hi. We're just checking  
7 in with you now. We're on the status and any comments that  
8 you have --

9 MS. BELENKY: Yes.

10 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: -- on the previous  
11 comments you've heard from applicant and staff.

12 MS. BELENKY: Yes. Well, I have to say I too like  
13 Mr. Ratliff did not come to this prepared to make my final  
14 speech at the final hearing.

15 But there are several issues that have been  
16 brought up that the Center does disagree with. And just  
17 starting at the beginning I will try not to take too long.

18 We believe the project description is also  
19 somewhat disputed at this time. And that also keys into the  
20 question of alternatives et cetera. So it is an important  
21 thing to keep in mind that those are tied together.

22 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Can you give me a little  
23 more specificity on that just so I know what you're talking  
24 about.

25 MS. BELENKY: Well I think it very much goes to

1 what Mr. Ratliff and Mr. Harris were both saying about the  
2 objectives of the applicant versus a description of the  
3 project that is more general so that you can have a range of  
4 alternatives. And so --

5 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Okay. So the objectives.

6 MS. BELENKY: -- when you (audio dropped) -- yeah.  
7 So, it is an issue that may still be disputed and I believe  
8 in other similar projects we did continue to contest that  
9 through the process.

10 So, certainly, we agree with most of the other  
11 issues that have been raised. I believe that soil and  
12 surface hydrology, there still may be some significant  
13 questions there. So I believe that the Center would keep  
14 that on the contested list as well.

15 And mitigation issues in general, I think there  
16 are some significant questions that are still disputed  
17 there.

18 I did want to, as well, respond to a few things  
19 that the applicant raised which Mr. Ratliff mentioned as  
20 well. But certainly, the question of special status species  
21 and sensitive species, this is not the first time I've heard  
22 this raised before one of the committees, perhaps it will  
23 not be the last time. But I do not think it is a, I think  
24 it's a bit of a red herring.

25 And clearly, under California law, under CEQA and

1 the many other statutes, species including many of the  
2 special status plants are to be preserved. And we don't  
3 think, I think that is just sort of a tangent that for some  
4 reason the applicant has decided to go down.

5 In addition, and the question of how those lists  
6 are created et cetera. The question of mitigation and the  
7 so-called double or multiple counting, we actually from the  
8 Center's point of view have some very significant problems  
9 with nesting and limiting the mitigation too narrowly.  
10 While in a perfect world perhaps one could mitigate every  
11 acre with another acre that looks exactly like it; that is  
12 not exactly how the world works.

13 Also, connectivity of acreage makes a very big  
14 difference in mitigation and so it may, it is generally the  
15 case that mitigation needs to be far more than one to one in  
16 order to even provide any significant mitigation so that  
17 there's a net benefit to the species.

18 There's clearly losses. We need to ensure that  
19 the mitigation is sufficient to provide a net benefit  
20 otherwise you haven't actually mitigated for anything.

21 The, I was curious about the cultural resource  
22 although that is not something the Center has focussed on.  
23 We would say that we are happy to see a more in-depth  
24 evaluation of cultural resources given the mistakes that  
25 have been made in the past in other, in other projects

1 approved by the Committee where these issues were glossed  
2 over.

3 So we certainly want to see more in-depth there as  
4 well as with many other questions.

5 Another issue with that is certainly as concerned,  
6 for example, with Kit Fox that, you know, unprecedented new  
7 issues have arisen in other projects regarding Kit Fox and  
8 we need to take, I guess the term now everyone is using is a  
9 conservative approach. We need to take an approach that  
10 ensures that these issues are dealt with up front and not  
11 waiting until a disaster happens and then trying to repair  
12 the damage. That is not what CEQA contemplates and we  
13 really don't want to see that here.

14 As far as alternatives, I think that that will  
15 remain disputed. And the question of what's reasonably  
16 foreseeable in a no project world has to take into account a  
17 lot of questions as to why these homes (audio dropped)  
18 applied, for example, haven't been developed to date.

19 So, certainly, there may be reasonable to have  
20 more than one no project alternative.

21 The PV alternative we think is very important and  
22 we also it's important to keep in mind that these large-  
23 scale projects are not the only alternative for fulfilling  
24 our needs for renewable energy but what we'd like to see is  
25 in base and distributed energy take a much larger role and

1 be also considered as a full alternative.

2 So those are just sort of the highlights. I think  
3 there will be, remain disputed issues, contested issues that  
4 will need to go to hearing. From the Center's point of view  
5 certainly biological, water and alternatives, growth  
6 inducing impacts, soils and surface water.

7 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you Ms. Belenky. I  
8 just wanted to ask you one question. You were just talking  
9 about the mitigation or, you were talking about -- okay,  
10 time out, I'm drawing a blank. The last point you made was  
11 on what issue?

12 MS. BELENKY: The last point I made?

13 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Yeah.

14 MS. BELENKY: Was on alternatives?

15 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: It was on alternatives  
16 (confers with Commissioner Peterman) distributed generation,  
17 thank you. Because as you were speaking I was thinking.  
18 And I haven't, I confess I haven't read the alternatives  
19 section yet but I was wondering, typically staff does touch  
20 upon distributed generation as an alternative. And I just  
21 wanted to know whether there was anything in the  
22 alternatives section as it stands in the PSA; did they avoid  
23 the topic or is it just insufficiently handled or what is  
24 your view on that?

25 MS. BELENKY: I have not had time to look at it

1 in-depth so I'm not going in -- I'm not going to give you an  
2 answer. The point is, I think what we want is not just that  
3 it's mentioned, we want it to be seriously considered and we  
4 would hope that the Committee and the Commission will start  
5 looking to these as true alternatives and alternatives  
6 aren't just to fulfill the CEQA requirement so that you have  
7 a bulletproof decision. That should not be, and in fact,  
8 that's an extremely cynical way of looking at alternatives.

9 Alternatives really should be things that are  
10 feasible and can avoid the impacts. And that's very much  
11 what we want the Commission, this Committee and the  
12 Commission to be focussed on; that there are other ways to  
13 go about fulfilling our needs for renewable energy.

14 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: All right. I appreciate  
15 that. I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't, there was  
16 an absence, if you were pointing out an absence of something  
17 and it wasn't in there then now would be the time to jump on  
18 it. So, okay. I thank you very much for that Ms. Belenky.

19 Did Jon Zellhoefer come on the line? Jon are you  
20 out there?

21 (No response.)

22 Or Jack Prichett, are you on the line?

23 (No response.)

24 Okay. I know I have Cindy MacDonald on the line.  
25 Cindy go ahead. You have the floor.



1 MS. MacDONALD: All right. Well, thank you very  
2 much. Well, I did not come prepared myself but I will just  
3 go off the top of my head based on the lead that the  
4 applicant went.

5 I have, the more I've studied this project and  
6 compared and cross referenced the data requests, the  
7 original AFC filed et cetera the more questions have arisen  
8 about it. And so, I guess on a topic-by-topic basis I'll  
9 try to hit some of the highlights that are of my concern  
10 now.

11 The first would be the project description that so  
12 far, and I'll include these in my comments, but there seems  
13 to be some real question about the actual amount of energy  
14 that this, the proposed project is, will actually make.

15 It's advertised as a 500 megawatt project. We did  
16 discuss this during the workshop last week. I got two  
17 different answers.

18 One, that that 500 megawatts would be generated  
19 per day, one that it would be generated per hour. So that's  
20 one of the issues I'm kind of concerned with.

21 In addition to the fact that in the boiler  
22 optimization plan the applicant is estimating about 3,000  
23 full load hours a year which, as near as I can figure, works  
24 out about eight hours a day or -- anyway, those are, so the  
25 project description of what we're actually getting for our

1 resources is some concern to me.

2 With respect to air quality a couple of things  
3 that have really stood out. The first is the lack of any  
4 sort of PM 10, PM 2.5 limits on the operational portion of  
5 the project which, I'm sure everybody is very aware that  
6 fugitive dust and dust impacts in general are significant  
7 concern and so far I have not been able to secure any  
8 answers as to, will there be any limits in the permit to  
9 operate over the lifetime of the project and what the  
10 applicant and the CEC staff has developed to ensure that  
11 dust suppression is sufficient throughout the course of the  
12 operation.

13 I also think the current mitigation measure for  
14 that issue is to develop the dust control plan after the  
15 project is approved and I have been researching a variety of  
16 dust (audio dropped) methods which I'll include in my  
17 comments. But each of them have different kinds of impacts,  
18 possibly increased water use if they go with water trucks  
19 over the life of the project et cetera. So, that's one of  
20 the concerns that I have.

21 Another one is that (audio dropped) boiler  
22 optimization revision, the applicant went from 17 mirror  
23 washing machines in the near, far from tower zones; it's  
24 actually divided into two different zones for operation and  
25 that there's even questions about that, there's a lot of

1 information that I haven't been able to find regarding how  
2 that's going to be set up. But, even contradictory  
3 information but setting that aside, the applicant went from  
4 17 mirror washing machines in the far from tower zones to 7  
5 and based on the number of mirrors that are projected to be  
6 part of the operation it is not feasible that these mirrors  
7 will be cleaned within the time table that the applicant  
8 projects to clean these mirrors. And the mirrors are the  
9 critical part of the renewable energy source. So there's  
10 some questions there kind in terms of the air quality.

11           Either they're going to need a lot more mirror  
12 washing machines and those emissions need to be factored in  
13 or the mirrors are going to take a lot longer to clean. So  
14 air quality wise that's some of the things I have concerns  
15 about.

16           Biological resources I have a lot of concerns  
17 about some of which I'm really glad to see the workshop on  
18 the avian flux because there is a lot of migratory birds  
19 that go through this area. I will be presenting at least  
20 some of them through photos that we have taken over the  
21 years.

22           And I also wanted to mention that the applicant  
23 had said that the only threatened and endangered species  
24 involved in the project site was the Desert Tortoise and I  
25 wanted to remind everybody that there's a lot of eagles and

1 various raptors in the area.

2 So the birds are also protected as well as the  
3 eagles. I'd like to see that addressed more.

4 Let's see, cultural resources, again, there's  
5 (audio dropped) dispute. I don't have, I'm not in  
6 disagreement with that.

7 One other thing I would like to add is one of the,  
8 one of my submissions I showed a newspaper article that  
9 mentioned an Indian burial site that was within the area  
10 that was at the time the article was six years old and at  
11 the time it was already calling a 100 year old burial site.

12 And that hasn't been addressed at all. So, obviously, I  
13 would like to see that put on the table because I think  
14 that's a pretty serious issue as well.

15 Growth inducing impacts, that's kind of tied in  
16 with an issue, a land use issue that I have significant  
17 concerns about. That being, proposed project is for 32  
18 hundred and 27 acres. However, the applicant is, has  
19 secured the lease option to 10,000 acres or over two-thirds  
20 more acres than the proposed project site.

21 This fact is not dealt with at all by staff in the  
22 Preliminary Staff Assessment and there's only one mention of  
23 this connection in their fiscal and financial impact  
24 analysis which that acreage is of significant concern to  
25 Inyo County regarding revenue generation. But I have

1 concerns with respect to what kind of development can happen  
2 if the CEC has any jurisdiction over conditions of permit  
3 to, you know, perhaps prevent development, if there is  
4 concerns with, can the applicant access water rights from  
5 those additional acres.

6           There's also in the financial and fiscal impact  
7 analysis, there's also references that allude to the  
8 possibility of temporary working, worker housing that has  
9 not been explored yet. So hopefully I'm going to bring, I'm  
10 trying to bring that to attention. And staff can address  
11 that.

12           One of the issues that I heard the applicant  
13 discuss in kind of a large general issue has me very  
14 concerned is the jurisdictional issues that are going on  
15 with this particular project.

16           And I feel that the applicant is playing both  
17 sides against the middle in that they are trying very hard  
18 to limit, to limit this process of the CEQA equivalency  
19 process and the AFC process to very narrow parameters within  
20 California so that they can circumvent a lot of the  
21 potential impacts that will happen on the Nevada side.

22           One of these that stands out very clearly to me is  
23 the issue of the water, the jurisdictional water. And I  
24 don't know if anybody is aware of it but in Nevada and in  
25 the Pahrump, with the Pahrump Valley Aquifer you are

1 required to submit applications for water rights that have  
2 to be approved.

3           And the applicant clearly states in the executive  
4 summary that they are targeting the Pahrump Valley Water  
5 Basin for this project but they are not going to be, or  
6 apparent, I don't know if they are or not, but anyway,  
7 there's a lot of jurisdictional issues around here that I'm  
8 going to bring up and I have questions about because I know  
9 the CEC really doesn't have jurisdiction to deal with those.  
10   And I'm not sure which agency will.

11           Now a mention was made of BLM and NEPA but one of  
12 the things that I've noted is that it is unclear at this  
13 point in time to what extent BLM will analyze the proposed  
14 project because the applicant has continued to reference  
15 their involvement as only being with the gas line and the  
16 transmission line.

17           And so, I, while there's assurances that it will  
18 be analyzed as a complete project, I see nothing to indicate  
19 that BLM will actually be doing that.

20           The second issue along that line when they were  
21 bringing up the visual resource issue, they only used the  
22 Nevada BLM visual resource categories but there's also a lot  
23 of California land, Pahrump Valley wilderness and BLM land  
24 that's surrounds it on the California side and somehow the  
25 California BLM, I'm not aware of them being involved at all

1 in this process towards maybe what their visual resource  
2 classes are or their particular land use plans are through  
3 there. So jurisdictional issues is a significant concern to  
4 me.

5 The public health. There's an issue with Valley  
6 Fever with respect to our soil. It is been noted in Pahrump  
7 and has caused problems in Pahrump.

8 I found staff's, staff's way of dealing with this,  
9 their only recommendation that I saw was that various  
10 regulatory agencies have acknowledged during days of high  
11 winds residents can stay indoors. I don't find that a  
12 satisfactory or appropriate approach to the situation. And  
13 I especially don't think that it's applicable to visitors,  
14 recreational people in the area, perhaps Front Site which  
15 gets quite a few visitors annually, maybe Saint Teresa.

16 So, there's certain health implications with that  
17 that I don't think are being taken seriously enough.

18 The soil and surface water. At the workshop I  
19 brought this up. I have serious concerns and I have been  
20 making them since my first public comments regarding the  
21 ability of the site to even be suitable for the proposed  
22 project.

23 It's sitting at the bottom of an alluvial fan and  
24 a pretty good flood channel. We have flash flood signs that  
25 are out right along the border of the proposed project site.

1           The soil that we have in the preliminary  
2 geotechnical report they specifically stated that certain  
3 structures, they could not be allowed to stand in water.  
4 And when it gets wet that's a serious concern because things  
5 sink. And big things sink. And we're going to have at  
6 least a 170,000 mirrors that are sitting in this soil that  
7 may be impacted, that may -- anyway, I have a lot of  
8 concerns with the soils and surface water section which in  
9 the comments I'll try to illustrate better.

10           Traffic and transportation. Obviously, I have  
11 some issues with. I was quite surprised to hear the  
12 applicant say, we feel that they are all resolved.

13           Obviously, if the data is different in the AFC  
14 files versus what they're telling people in the workshops  
15 then they need to find a way to make that consistent, that  
16 data consistent.

17           At this point in time they've made no response to  
18 the requests for them to correct any errors that might be  
19 associated with the traffic. And so, I really can't comment  
20 much farther because I have two different stories about one  
21 traffic figure but, as I tried to point out, that that  
22 ripples out into a variety of impacts about the project that  
23 until the applicant chooses to address them there's really  
24 nothing that can be resolved about it.

25           Visual resources. I still have issues with the



1 lack of nighttime analysis that has been involved. I had  
2 found us a section in the AFC files that said that the  
3 mirrors were going to glow in the dark and those have not  
4 yet been addressed.

5 I also noticed that in the hazardous materials  
6 section the applicant has added thousands of batteries. So  
7 I'm not really sure what those batteries are for but at this  
8 point in time I'm not clear whether those mirrors are going  
9 to be lit up at night or not nor because the area is very  
10 remote it has a lot of, when the moon is full you can see  
11 very, very well; enough to walk anywhere on the desert floor  
12 without any help. And I'm not really sure what a 180,000,  
13 90,000 mirrors are going to look like during full moon.

14 Waste management. The only thing that I could  
15 think of off of the top of my head is trying to find out,  
16 the applicant intends to use septic tanks and leach fields  
17 for the project. And Dana, I believe Dana Crom said she  
18 would get with me to see if an industrial facility can use  
19 the same domestic, domestic waste systems.

20 Water supply. Some serious issues regarding its  
21 (audio dropped) I mean there is limited data. Nobody  
22 disputes that. But the data that we do have show nothing  
23 but declining water levels, lack of recharge and there is  
24 some real questions of whether the basin can support or that  
25 water in that area can support the project over its

1 lifetime.

2 But of the mitigation measures that I have  
3 concerns with is staff has recommended that the applicant  
4 replace 163 acre feet a year to help offset the project  
5 impacts. However there is no mention of or definition of  
6 what, replace, means. If it's retiring the water rights  
7 there is no mention of retiring water rights. So I have  
8 concerns that by requiring the applicant to secure an  
9 additional 163 acre feet without putting the stipulation  
10 that they must retire it, that in essence it will grant the  
11 applicant 300 acre feet a year. So that's one issue.

12 The second issue as on a much more personal level  
13 is, as a well owner there is a significant amount of burden  
14 that is going to be placed on us if we want any protection.

15 And staff has deemed that if we, whoever agrees to this,  
16 that will reduce the project's impacts to our water supply  
17 and to our wells to less than significant.

18 But it seems to me that the mitigation measures  
19 are shifting the burden of proof on to us. We have to sign  
20 up. We have to have the monitoring put on our wells. We  
21 have to allow the applicant on our property at will. We  
22 have to open our records and our books. We have to prove  
23 what we use, when we use it and for how long. And I don't  
24 really find that a satisfactory mitigation measure.

25 Not to mention, if you don't agree with it, can it

1 really be considered less than significant?

2 Facility design. I was absolutely, I can't tell  
3 you my disappointment at how that small that section was. I  
4 was really looking forward to some clear analytical detailed  
5 kind of outlines regarding what we're really looking at  
6 because of so much of the data being rather kind of obscure  
7 or even contradictory.

8 I was very disappointed in the PSA at how little  
9 information was available and how the majority of compliance  
10 was all determined that would happen after the project was  
11 approved.

12 And transmission system and engineering. There  
13 are contradictory information in both the applicant's  
14 boiler, the revised boiler optimization plan as well as  
15 staff's PSA. Both of them have the switchyard located on  
16 the California side of the border in some parts and both of  
17 them have the switchyard located on the Nevada side of the  
18 border. And so I'm not really sure what I'm looking at.

19 But why this is significant to me is the sulfur  
20 fluorohexide (sic), the SF<sub>6</sub> and the greenhouse gases  
21 associated with it have gone up about 400 pounds. Hello?

22 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Yes. We can hear you.

23 MS. MACDONALD: Sorry, I'm getting a bunch of  
24 static. Anyway the sulfur fluorohexide has gone up about  
25 400 pounds from the original AFC files and I can find no

1 data to support this increase. And so, I'm concerned that  
2 if the switchyard is moved over to the Nevada side of the  
3 border, can that or will that allow this additional increase  
4 in greenhouse gas production to be moved outside of the CEC  
5 assessment?

6 And then finally, alternatives. Obviously, I have  
7 been asking staff to look at the alternatives of using fuel  
8 cells given the fact that California's goal is to generate  
9 renewable energy and that these have the potential of  
10 generating the energy that the project would supply but with  
11 much less significant impacts.

12 I was very disappointed to see that merely two  
13 websites and a letter dated over a year ago were used to  
14 dismiss this. However, during the workshop, Jeanine Hinde  
15 who is doing the alternative section promised to go back,  
16 revisit it, take another look at it and so I guess we'll  
17 just have to wait and see what kind of, what kind of  
18 analysis she gives regarding that. So that may or may not  
19 still be on the table.

20 So I think that kind of covered most of the main  
21 topics.

22 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Well --

23 MS. MACDONALD: Thank you.

24 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: -- Ms. MacDonald I want to  
25 thank you and before I, I'm going to turn to the County of

1 Inyo next, but before I do just want to say that it sounds  
2 to me like the parties are deeply engaged in a very robust  
3 discussion on all of these topics. And this sounds very  
4 productive to me. And I really want to thank all of the  
5 parties because clearly everybody is elbow deep in the  
6 issues that are going on. And this sounds very productive  
7 to me and I want to encourage you all and thank you all for  
8 your participation because this sounds like this is all  
9 good. This is very productive and I think that we, if you  
10 keep talking including these upcoming workshops a lot of  
11 things can be resolved.

12           You know, I understand some things will not,  
13 cannot be resolved and that's fine. But at least we can  
14 resolve that which can be. And I want to just say that I'm  
15 very impressed with everybody's really conscientious  
16 participation. So I want to thank you Ms. MacDonald and all  
17 the intervenors.

18           Mr. Zellhoefer or Mr. Prichett, are you out there  
19 on the phone?

20           (No response.)

21           Okay. Let's hear from Inyo County. Go ahead  
22 Ms. Crom.

23           MS. CROM: Thank you. I want to start by thanking  
24 staff and the applicant and everyone for making the trek to  
25 Bishop for the PSA workshop on June 27th. I know poor Mike

1 is still struggling with webex and it wasn't working as well  
2 as we had wanted but I think it was very productive and we  
3 certainly appreciated everybody coming over to our neck of  
4 the woods to obtain comments.

5 With respect to the County's comments I am not  
6 going to give you a closing statement. I'm not even going  
7 to pretend to give you a closing statement. We are  
8 gathering them right now and we will be submitting them in  
9 writing.

10 I will confirm that BrightSource did submit last  
11 week a request for a general plan overlay and a zoning  
12 reclassification overlay. Again, that will be going to the  
13 Board of Supervisors tomorrow along with a reimbursement  
14 contract conditioned upon me receiving a check tomorrow  
15 morning. So that's the third element that's missing before  
16 we can process that.

17 Once we have all three items and the Board has  
18 approved the agreement, we will begin processing that  
19 application and working with BrightSource and with counsel  
20 on that.

21 As for the problem sections as identified by the  
22 applicant the only additional section that we have comments  
23 on that could be problematic would be traffic and  
24 transportation. And is primarily the County's concern that  
25 if there will be no truck traffic on the west side of Old

1 Spanish Trail going along Highway 127 that we have some  
2 mechanism by which to enforce that. And that's something  
3 that I think we will be able to work out.

4 We, I share a lot of the comments made by Mr.  
5 Ratliff concerning the jurisdictional issues here and the,  
6 what has been criticized as the conservative approach that  
7 is taken by staff.

8 I will note that Inyo County when it comes to  
9 groundwater resources is probably the foremost expert in the  
10 state of California on monitoring those resources and  
11 protecting them and trying to weigh one party's desire to  
12 have those resources against the fragile environment from  
13 which they come.

14 And I would just simply say, I don't think a  
15 mitigation and monitoring plan is conservative and I would  
16 also suggest, or actually would indicate, that is would be  
17 mandated under Title 21 if Inyo County were licensing this  
18 project.

19 And again, we will be commenting in full on that.

20 With respect to alternatives, I have to admit, I  
21 was wrong. I will admit, Jeff, it's 170 parcels on the  
22 project site not 270. So I was incorrect. But there are  
23 170 lots out on the project site.

24 I understand where Mr. Harris is going with this.  
25 I may not necessarily agree with him on the alternatives

1 analysis. But I would just note as I did last week that in  
2 order for those lots to be developed a building permit would  
3 be conditioned on the availability of a reliable water  
4 source.

5 So, for what's that worth, I'm sure we'll all be  
6 taking that into consideration when determining what could  
7 happen to this project.

8 I did want to address Cindy's question about  
9 septic tanks. And, Cindy, we did talk to the environmental  
10 health director and as long as the septic tank is just being  
11 used for employee or regular restrooms a septic tank is  
12 appropriate. It is not appropriate for disposal of  
13 industrial waste.

14 What I understand is the septic that is being  
15 proposed for this project would be basically for the  
16 employees' restroom and kitchen and what not would be. So  
17 it would be your regular household-type waste. And that  
18 would be appropriate.

19 And we have used that before, specifically on the  
20 Crystal Geyser Project in Lone Pine.

21 I will say in follow up to Ms. MacDonald's  
22 comments, and the County will be commenting on this, we did  
23 also take issue with what we considered to be the shift of  
24 the burden to the local well owners with respect to  
25 mitigation. And we will be proposing mitigation which puts



1 most of the burden on BrightSource as opposed to the local  
2 well owners.

3           Obviously, I am a well owner and if you asked me  
4 the depth of my well and how my well worked and how my pump  
5 worked, I couldn't tell you. I would have to call my well  
6 guy.

7           And so, a lot of the questions that are being  
8 asked, I think, may be outside the general knowledge of the  
9 local well owners. And it is incumbent on BrightSource as  
10 the project proponent to mitigate for any damages caused to  
11 those wells, not for the homeowners to prove that their  
12 wells have indeed affected by the pumping.

13           And then I too have a question about the  
14 switchyard. I don't believe that the question has been  
15 ultimately answered. And I don't know if BrightSource is  
16 prepared to answer it.

17           It does have a socio-economic impact to the County  
18 if the switchyard is moved to the state of Nevada. I think  
19 I've noted that before. So we will need an answer to that.

20           With respect to the socio-economic analysis  
21 BrightSource is correct in that the County is looking more  
22 at the analysis of the revenue streams into the County in  
23 light of the Aspen Report.

24           Preliminary discussions have occurred with the  
25 applicant to address, essentially, the sales and use tax.

1 It is very technical, sales and use tax in this either and  
2 the designation of the County as the point of sale for  
3 purposes of sale and use tax is not as simple as simply  
4 checking a form on a box. And so, I think there is a bit of  
5 analysis that needs to be done there and some detailed  
6 requirements that will need to be agreed to by BrightSource  
7 in order for the County to realize even a fraction of what  
8 Dr. McCann anticipates would be realized by the County. But  
9 at this point we are looking at the income stream as opposed  
10 disputing the actual fiscal impacts to the County so long as  
11 we can assume that the income stream is large enough to  
12 cover an, either, scenario; that presented by Dr. McCann or  
13 that presented by the County.

14 Obviously, if the analysis proves that Dr. McCann  
15 is incorrect and those revenues will not cover the County's  
16 anticipated impact costs then we will be revisiting the  
17 other issues.

18 So that's where I think we are with the County.

19 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you very much, very  
20 clear. And so, the take away here is the application  
21 process is open. There is obviously open communication  
22 between applicant and the County. And hopefully we'll --  
23 I'm not sure, by the way, whether we're going to need, we  
24 probably will have to keep that status conference date in  
25 August. I think we said August, let me look at my notice, I

1 think it was August 16th if I'm not mistaken.

2 UNIDENTIFIED PHONE PARTICIPANT: The 16th, yes.

3 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Which?

4 UNIDENTIFIED PHONE PARTICIPANT: The 16th.

5 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: The 16th. Okay, good.

6 This is the million dollar question, is when is the FSA  
7 coming out because my expectation when we created that  
8 schedule was the FSA was coming out on August 1st. And if  
9 so, then that would moot out the need for a status  
10 conference afterwards because the next thing that would  
11 happen would be a prehearing conference.

12 So what is the status with the FSA, staff? Mr.  
13 Ratliff.

14 MR. RATLIFF: Well I think you've heard the kinds  
15 of issues that we're currently dealing with. Certain other  
16 pieces are going to happen that are important.

17 One is the pump test. We heard today that the  
18 applicant is going to conduct a new pump test given some of  
19 the criticisms it received over the first one.

20 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Are you going to post a  
21 guard this time?

22 MR. RATLIFF: And there will be a solar flux  
23 analysis that I think is an important piece on the  
24 biological issue.

25 The applicant announced at the Pahrump workshop,

1 although we didn't, unfortunately, end up discussing that  
2 because we were discussing so many other things; that it  
3 will be, providing as you heard today, offsets, so called  
4 for water, meaning the purchase of water rights on the  
5 Nevada side of the border presumably for retirement in  
6 quantity enough to mitigate the overall basin impacts of the  
7 pumping that is going to occur at the project site.

8           The details of that have not, to my knowledge,  
9 been disclosed. We need to understand that.

10           One of the issues that has been raised about this  
11 concept is, are these going to be offsets of non-productive,  
12 currently non-productive wells that, in other words, are  
13 associated with projects that have long since been  
14 discontinued or would they be something, perhaps, different  
15 from that and does it matter, and if so, if it does matter,  
16 what do you do about that?

17           We haven't had that discussion yet. And I think  
18 that's one of the things that is important in trying to  
19 figure out what the mitigation would be.

20           We're also currently trying to agree on, and when  
21 I say, we, I mean, not just staff and the applicant but the  
22 biological agencies as well, on how Desert Tortoise  
23 relocation would occur and whether it's relocation or  
24 translocation meaning how far you move the tortoise. There  
25 seems to be general, I think, I mean I may be

1 oversimplifying general biological agreement, that the  
2 better habitat for the tortoise or the better thing for the  
3 tortoise at least, is to move them the shortest distance  
4 possible to the nearest habitat that's good which is in  
5 Nevada which creates certain concerns with regard to our  
6 sister agency Fish and Game which would not allow that  
7 without a permit, a separate permit, from their agency.

8 But, variations on this have been discussed which  
9 might avoid any formal, we might allow the tortoises to self  
10 deport as the term has been used.

11 And that's BrightSource's latest proposal. And I  
12 think the agencies may be all in agreement with that. But  
13 it's an issue we're still working out. I think we're  
14 getting close to maybe closure on that issue but I'm not  
15 sure yet.

16 But my overall point of all this and meandering  
17 discussion is that we have a great deal to accomplish in  
18 August to try to get an FSA.

19 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Well let me ask you this.  
20 Let's zero in on a couple of things. Okay, so the pump  
21 test, is that scheduled now or do we know when that's going  
22 to happen?

23 MR. JENSEN: Yeah, the pump test I think may be  
24 being mischaracterized a bit. We haven't finalized our  
25 decision to do the pump test.

1           We're moving in a direction where we will likely  
2 do it. Staff has provided clear indication that it's not an  
3 obligation that they're asking for that to be redone because  
4 they're not sure what impact, if any, that will have on  
5 their analysis of the water. It gets into a really  
6 technical discussion that we won't get into now.

7           But in essence we feel compelled to redo the test  
8 for our own needs as it relates to our understanding of, you  
9 know, ultimately we had a pump test that was stopped short  
10 because of vandalism. And that's led to a lot of questions.

11           Unfortunately, we're convinced that we already  
12 know the outcome of the revised test. And I don't know that  
13 staff necessarily disagrees that we all agree that the  
14 likelihood is the outcomes is going to be exactly the same  
15 as the previous test that was performed; but just so we  
16 don't ever have to hear the word, vandalism, again, whether  
17 is our investors or other third-party entities that come  
18 into the process, we need to understand that.

19           So, but we did make it clear to staff at the last  
20 workshop that the revised test should not have a schedule  
21 impact as it relates to the issuance of the FSA because  
22 frankly I don't think there's anything that that test will  
23 reveal that would have an impact on the FSA.

24           Perhaps I'm incorrect on that statement but we are  
25 moving forward in aggressive fashion, again, not fully

1 committing to doing it today but the results of that could  
2 be received anywhere from two to four weeks from today.

3 And so, if there is information revealed that  
4 could have an impact in the FSA we're not sure how that  
5 plays into the process.

6 But we think that the study results we provided  
7 from the original EPT in our minds are conclusive and  
8 provide sufficient understanding of the elements of the  
9 aquifer that were, we feel that the FSA should move forward  
10 on that issue, that issue alone.

11 We don't think that the revised EPT test should be  
12 a reason for delay in the FSA.

13 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: And what's a, let's just  
14 assume hypothetically you are able to get the pump test done  
15 in two to four weeks, is there some lag between those  
16 results getting to staff? Is there some analysis that needs  
17 to elongate the process?

18 MR. JENSEN: Yeah. The last time around our  
19 consultants prepared a brief for the parties that they  
20 provided very quick feedback, mainly, verbally and a quick  
21 PowerPoint presentation. And then it was followed by a  
22 report, a full-documented report I believe two weeks after  
23 that fact.

24 But, we would be able to provide some immediate  
25 feedback. Again, I believe that the results of the report

1 are going to be in parallel to the previous -- so if there  
2 is some discrepancy that we identify, obviously, we would  
3 notify staff of the discrepancy and work closely in  
4 conjunction with the team.

5 But again, we expect it to chart and graph and  
6 follow the same pump curves that we had determined in our  
7 initial results. So if there is a discrepancy we will  
8 notify quickly. But we don't expect the outcome to be any  
9 different, substantially from the original test.

10 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: All right. So either you  
11 have same or similar results in which case the FSA comes out  
12 quickly because there's no real change there or else you  
13 have wildly different results and then we've got a real  
14 timing problem that would affect that I can see.

15 So, the results of the solar flux reports that's  
16 coming out, and when is that due, if we know?

17 MR. RATLIFF: Well, we heard that it would be  
18 delivered on the 23rd of July.

19 MR. JENSEN: That's correct. We've got some data  
20 that we're preparing now and we do anticipate along with the  
21 Rio Mesa Solar Project submitting additional information on  
22 July 23rd.

23 MR. RATLIFF: And that would be two weeks before  
24 the workshop that we anticipate.

25 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Two weeks before. So that



1 would be, so two weeks after July 23rd would be a workshop  
2 which of course the Hearing Committee encourages.

3 But, I'm just quickly looking at the calendar.

4 MR. RATLIFF: If I could just add on the pump  
5 test?

6 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Yes.

7 MR. RATLIFF: We are going to be discussing how  
8 the pump test would be done with the applicant on Friday. I  
9 think we'll be discussing certain parameters such as the  
10 depth of the monitoring wells and the duration which is also  
11 an important factor.

12 Obviously, this pump test is anticipated to be  
13 longer than the last one.

14 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Uh-hum.

15 MR. HARRIS: If I could just add too. On both  
16 these issues, we see this as supplemental information.  
17 There's already a lot of information in the record on both  
18 these issues, the previous tests and all the aquifer  
19 characterizations.

20 We've kind of been put in a tough position here.  
21 You know, if we, if push came to shove and you said, we're  
22 not going to release the document unless you give us this  
23 result, we'd probably not do the test. But we don't think  
24 that's a good result for anybody moving forward.

25 On the solar flux issue, there is information in

1 the record already. I would, again, characterize what's  
2 coming on the 23rd as supplemental to that. There's the  
3 McCrary Study which everybody cites to, either loving or  
4 hating.

5 But at the end of the day there is that  
6 information on the operating solar towers. And there's also  
7 other information about real-world experience both at SEDC  
8 and other solar facilities.

9 And so I don't want to leave the impression that  
10 the Commission couldn't move forward without this  
11 information. But I think maybe we're better off with the  
12 supplemental.

13 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Well, yeah. So, really  
14 what it looks to me like, you have a workshop on the 13th or  
15 so.

16 MS. BELENKY: Excuse me.

17 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Is that someone on the  
18 phone?

19 MS. BELENKY: Sorry. This is Lisa Belenky. I'm  
20 not sure I understand exactly what was just said. And I  
21 would just like before we move on to make sure I understand  
22 that the applicant just said something about that they  
23 wouldn't provide the results of the pump test to the  
24 Commission.

25 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Go ahead Mr. Harris.

1 MR. HARRIS: No. I'm sorry Lisa, that was  
2 unclear. If we were put in a black and white situation of  
3 saying, do another pump test or not in terms of delaying the  
4 schedule, we probably wouldn't do an additional pump test.  
5 It's that important that you guys all move forward.

6 I don't think we're being given that black and  
7 white choice here, so. I'm sorry if I confused you and  
8 maybe I didn't clear it up with that statement, but.

9 MS. BELENKY: Yeah, this is --

10 MR. HARRIS: If we do it --

11 MS. BELENKY: -- this actually --

12 MR. HARRIS: -- we will share it with you.

13 MS. BELENKY: -- this whole conversation is a  
14 little bit confusing. First of all, partly because there is  
15 no workshop yet scheduled. There was a date that was  
16 floated but I understand didn't work. And then, now I just  
17 heard today August 8th, unless I missed one of the notices.

18 MR. RATLIFF: I don't think it's been noticed yet.

19 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Right. Go ahead Mr.  
20 Monasmith. You were going to say.

21 MR. MONASMITH: Yeah, Mike Monasmith, project  
22 manager. It hasn't been noticed yet. But the project  
23 manager for the Rio Mesa proceeding and I are moving forward  
24 with a joint workshop on August 8th and we've cleared that  
25 primarily with both teams. And I do believe, Lisa, that

1 Eileen had indicated that the 8th, Eileen Anderson, had  
2 indicated the 8th worked for her and probably for you as  
3 well.

4 So I hope that that still remains the case. If  
5 not, we will look at another date. We really want to make  
6 sure it's, that it's good with CBD before we move ahead.

7 That has not been noticed yet but we're close to  
8 the point.

9 MS. BELENKY: Okay. I'm just having a hard time  
10 understanding what it is we're talking about now. There's  
11 still some more information that needs to come in. Staff is  
12 saying that they would prefer to delay the FSA until after  
13 they get that information.

14 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: That's the --

15 MS. BELENKY: Is that correct?

16 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: -- gist of what we're  
17 talking about. What I'm trying to zero in on is, obviously  
18 there's a time delay. I'm trying to get a sense of how much  
19 of one that we're looking at. And I was approaching it by  
20 really kind of narrowing down, okay, if there's a pump test  
21 and there's a solar flux test or an analysis coming in on  
22 solar flux; given that information and everything else we've  
23 heard, what would be a reasonable new date or a target date  
24 for the FSA to be published?

25 And that's what this whole discussion is really

1 about Lisa. I'm trying to get a sense of when we can expect  
2 an FSA to come on.

3 MR. RATLIFF: And I, if I'd had, if I'd finished  
4 my statement I would have said that our hope is that we  
5 could finish the FSA, that would have conclusions in all the  
6 important areas by September 11th.

7 I think that's ambitious but that's our goal. And  
8 I would also note that in our discussion with the County,  
9 the County will be considering the Adoption Board nexus  
10 which would conform to the project, they would, it's my  
11 understanding that they're intending to use a complete FSA.

12 I mean Ms. Crom can address that. But we don't  
13 really want to put out a document that isn't complete if the  
14 County is going to be utilizing.

15 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: That seems reasonable to  
16 me. I wonder, Mr. Harris, this really, I'm sure the only  
17 party that cares that this went from August 1st to September  
18 11th is the applicant right now. And I just want to hear  
19 from you on that topic.

20 MR. HARRIS: Okay. Well, you know, obviously  
21 that's concerning. That's a substantial slip from a  
22 document that was originally scheduled for March if I  
23 recall. So, you know, just my initial reaction is, really.

24 To Ms. Belenky's question, you know, I don't think  
25 the staff needs this information. And maybe the best way to

1 put this is, if it's get the FSA or get the information,  
2 we'll take the FSA.

3 We think there's benefit from having this  
4 additional information. So I'd like to see that moving  
5 forward.

6 In terms of what document Inyo uses, this is the  
7 first I've heard they've decided. I thought that was still  
8 undecided. I don't know if you have any view on that issue  
9 going forward.

10 But I do know that they can't do anything until  
11 they have an environmental document. So I understand, even  
12 with the application and the check and everything that  
13 they're going to be handcuffed until we can provide a  
14 pertinent environmental document, so.

15 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: So, again, this is not a  
16 perfect situation for the applicant but it's not death to  
17 the project or anything like that at this point? If I am  
18 correct.

19 MR. JENSEN: I understand what you're saying, yes.  
20 We'd prefer to be expedited or accelerated as much as  
21 possible. But the September 11th would not be death to the  
22 project.

23 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Okay. Well, again, this  
24 is one of the reasons why I don't go crazy putting out a  
25 schedule every other week during this point in the AFC

1 processes because there are so many things that can change,  
2 unforeseen circumstances. So I'm not inclined to issue  
3 another scheduling order until the FSA, until have a clear  
4 indication that the FSA is coming off. And then we can put  
5 in the rest of the schedule at that time.

6 I did have some more questions (turning to  
7 Commissioners) did you have questions? (side consultation  
8 away from mic) That's a good point. Yes. It does sound  
9 like August 16th is going to remain as set for a status  
10 conference unless that's a problem and prevents workshops or  
11 something. You'll let me know.

12 So that would be the, that is a good point. We  
13 would leave that, I just had a couple of questions. FSA  
14 we're looking at right now September 11th. That's an easy  
15 date to remember.

16 I just was, I was reading the geopaleo section and  
17 I was thinking about a 750 foot tower. And I just wanted  
18 verification in my mind as I'm trying to overlay and imagine  
19 if there were a combination of all sorts of forces that  
20 would cause these towers to fall over, is there any  
21 structure that humans would be in that would be within the  
22 path? In other words, there's a radius, the tower could  
23 fall over and I wanted to know, is it going to fall over and  
24 hit a road, a building?

25 MR. HARRIS: Well I guess the first thing, I'll

1 let Clay answer on that. But the first thing we want to do  
2 is obviously reassure everybody who's listening that they  
3 will be built to seismic standards. And mankind has built  
4 tall things in the past and they have been able to withstand  
5 earthquakes. But, to your direct question, go ahead.

6 MR. JENSEN: The administrative offices which is  
7 where most of the operations and controls will take place  
8 will be in the common area which would be over 750, 780 feet  
9 away from the site or from the tower locations.

10 But there are power block equipment and  
11 maintenance and operation staff that would be at the base of  
12 the tower within a 750 foot radius of the project.

13 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Okay. But it would stay  
14 in the footprint of the site.

15 MR. JENSEN: Yes. In no circumstance is the tower  
16 less than 750 feet away from the border of the project.

17 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: I just, I thought that but  
18 I just wanted verification on that. Okay. We've heard from  
19 all of the parties. Before I go to public comment is there  
20 anything else from applicant?

21 MR. HARRIS: I actually wanted to give my real  
22 summation speech which is, thank you for your approval  
23 (laughter). But let me say, in all seriousness, I didn't  
24 expect anybody else to have that kind of detailed list. But  
25 I do think this is part of the process.



1           We've got a very large document, you know, 11  
2 hundred and 59 pages plus another 99 pages of cultural  
3 thereafter. We didn't have an opportunity to react to the  
4 Committee and that is obviously today.

5           Our philosophy, if that's not too strong a word,  
6 is to put everything out there on the table and litigate the  
7 hell out of it so we have a complete record and nobody gets  
8 blindsided.

9           And I think that's actually the Commission's  
10 philosophy as well is to get these issues on the table, have  
11 them set forth and also to avoid unfair surprise. If people  
12 have other issues they're holding back I'd like to hear them  
13 sooner or later. I know the Committee is going to require  
14 to put them out there in their testimony.

15           And I do actually think that we will dwindle that  
16 number from nine, number nine down quite a bit through  
17 discussions with staff and the other parties in the workshop  
18 processing.

19           So I don't intend to have a summation speech that  
20 looks anything like my diatribe today. So thank you for  
21 indulging me and having us put things on the table but this  
22 is very much in the middle of the process. And we look  
23 forward to solving these issues.

24           HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you. Anything from  
25 staff?

1 MR. RATLIFF: No.

2 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you. Ms. Belenky,  
3 anything further?

4 MS. BELENKY: No, nothing further today. Thank  
5 you for your time.

6 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you. Ms. MacDonald  
7 anything further?

8 MS. MACDONALD: Yes. I'd kind of like to know if  
9 the applicant intends to address the questions regarding  
10 their traffic data at any time?

11 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: I'm going to look over to  
12 the applicant's table.

13 MR. HARRIS: Yes. We definitely do intend to  
14 answer. Her questions are complex because they involve more  
15 than one subject matter and they involve modelling  
16 assumptions.

17 And the reason they are complex is because we take  
18 very conservative modelling assumptions. And in air  
19 quality, for example, we assume a number of trucks that's  
20 higher than we ever anticipate seeing so that we get  
21 conservative results.

22 And so we have written one answer. We all took  
23 Excedrin, went and laid down for awhile and are working on  
24 writing another one. It's a pretty complex to explain  
25 exactly where all those things are but at the end of the day

1 it's the conservatism and the numbers that I think has  
2 caused the issues and the mislabelling of one key figure as  
3 a daily number that was actually a monthly number. But it's  
4 a 17 figure.

5 So we are working to unravel all that. I will say  
6 quite candidly that we have been sort of occupied with PSA  
7 comments. And we will get our attention back on that.

8 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you.

9 MS. MACDONALD: Do you have like a general idea?  
10 Will they be possibly ready prior to the close of the PSA  
11 comments? Or just, you know, I do appreciate the magnitude.

12 (Recorded message plays).

13 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Hang on one second.  
14 That's from Martinez, there we go. Go ahead.

15 MS. MACDONALD: Okay. I want to acknowledge I  
16 appreciate the magnitude and I couldn't help but laugh about  
17 the headache because I have shared many a headaches on this  
18 subject myself. So, I do appreciate that but I still think  
19 that that information is very important and so do you have  
20 any idea when you might be able to start providing some  
21 explanations and/or data regarding that?

22 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: So the question from Ms.  
23 MacDonald is when do you think you could satisfy her  
24 question?

25 MR. HARRIS: Well, it's all about schedule. And

1 our PSA comments more than anything else. I think we can  
2 give her a good preliminary answer in probably about within  
3 10 days.

4 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Okay.

5 MR. HARRIS: And certainly by the workshop. What  
6 day is the workshop?

7 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: It's August 8th. That's  
8 about a month away.

9 MR. HARRIS: Yeah, right. Yes.

10 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Okay. Anything further  
11 Ms. MacDonald?

12 MS. MACDONALD: No. Thank you very much.

13 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you very much.  
14 Anything further Inyo County Ms. Crom?

15 MS. CROM: Just to clarify on the issue of us  
16 using the FSA to process the application. That has been  
17 requested by the applicant. We are still looking at that  
18 inhouse.

19 However, if we're going to process based on the  
20 FSA obviously it needs to be as complete of an FSA as  
21 possible.

22 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Certainly.

23 MS. CROM: So --

24 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: And we appreciate your  
25 flexibility.

1 MS. CROM: We haven't made a decision.

2 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: But that's great and I  
3 appreciate your participation in your actual consideration  
4 of expediting that process. That helps alot.

5 Let's go now to public comment. Ms. Jennings are  
6 there any members of the public? She's shaking her head in  
7 the negative. There is nobody from the public here today.

8 So we're going to go to the phone. I'm going to  
9 first go through the names of people who've actually  
10 identified themselves and then I'll ask for the call-in  
11 users. If someone, if there's a name I call out who's  
12 associated with staff or applicant just let me know.

13 So I've got Bill Christian. Mr. Christian did you  
14 -- oh, he's hung up. I'm assuming --

15 MR. CHRISTIAN: No, I have no comment at this  
16 point.

17 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Oh, good. Thank you very  
18 much. It looked like you had hung up. Bradley Brownlow?

19 (No response.)

20 Okay. Christina Snow?

21 (No response.)

22 Jeanine Hinde (No response.)

23 Jeff Ogata I know is with the staff. Okay, Jim  
24 Stroh.

25 MR. STROH: No comment.

1 HEARING OFFICER CELLI: Thank you. Karen Parker?

2 (No response.)

3 Okay. Lisa DeCarlo is with staff. MaryLou

4 Taylor?

5 (No response.)

6 Mike Conway?

7 (No response.)

8 Pierre Martinez is with staff. I have a Rose M.

9 Did you wish to make a comment? Rose M or Rosem?

10 (No response.)

11 No? Okay. And then I have a person who  
12 identified themselves as "visitor." Did you wish to make a  
13 comment?

14 (No response.)

15 Okay. That being the case I'm going to go to the  
16 people who just called in and did not use a computer to  
17 identify themselves.

18 If you're on the telephone now and wish to make a  
19 public comment please just jump right in and we'll figure  
20 out who you are. Go ahead. Anyone who wishes to make a  
21 public comment please speak up.

22 (No response.)

23 Okay, hearing none at this time I will return the  
24 meeting back to Commissioner Douglas for adjournment.

25 PRESIDING MEMBER DOUGLAS: All right. Well,

1 again, I'd like to thank everybody for their participation  
2 and their preparation for the status conference. The  
3 Committee finds these status conferences really helpful and  
4 it's a good way for us to stay in a very up to date on  
5 concerns and on the status of issues and issue resolution.

6 Obviously, as we move through the process we'd  
7 also like to hear your input about the most helpful  
8 frequency of the status conferences so that we get what we  
9 need. But parties aren't, and hopefully you aren't spending  
10 a whole lot of time preparing for status conferences when  
11 you could be doing, you know, PSA comments or more analyses  
12 and so on.

13 And so there is a balance that we do need to  
14 strike here and I just wanted to invite your thoughts at the  
15 appropriate time on and welcome if there is a frequency  
16 issue that you want to raise. But from the Committee's  
17 point of view it's extremely helpful.

18 So again, thank you and with that we're adjourned.

19 (The Status Conference adjourned at 3:18 p.m.)

20 --oOo--

21

22

23

24

25

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JOHN COTA, an Electronic Reporter and Transcriber, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that I recorded the foregoing California Energy Commission Status Conference; that I thereafter transcribed it.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said conference or in any way interested in the outcome of said conference.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 16th day of June, 2012.

---

JOHN COTA